

Date: Sun, 29 Aug 93 04:30:11 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #312
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sun, 29 Aug 93 Volume 93 : Issue 312

Today's Topics:

4X1RU REJECT LIST
Call Sign Servers
Updating the test

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sat, 28 Aug 93 01:54:59 -0400
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!spool.mu.edu!darwin.sura.net!emory!dragon!nj8j!
ben@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: 4X1RU REJECT LIST
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

lkollar@nyx.cs.du.edu (Larry Kollar) writes:

> (The situation
> *is* changing slightly though -- now only the first node to pass a message
> is responsible for its content.)

But this does raise a question - how do the new FCC rules apply where the
originator and first relay are not under FCC jurisdiction? Do 'illegal
content' messages that originate outside the U.S. get a 'free ride'
through the U.S. packet system? Or (more likely) is the 'first relay'
under FCC jurisdiction held responsible? The latter would seem to
militate against PBBs with international links relaying messages which
are in a language not understood by the sysop.

Ben

```
+-----+-----+
| Ben Coleman NJ8J | "All that is not eternal is |
| AX.25: NJ8J@W4Q0.#EAL.#ATL.GA.USA.NA | eternally irrelevant." |
| Internet: ben@nj8j.atl.ga.us | C. S. Lewis |
+-----+-----+
```

Date: Sun, 29 Aug 1993 00:56:39 GMT
From: news.cerf.net!pagesat!indirect.com!nu7i@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Call Sign Servers
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Use the callbook at Buffalo University.
Do: telnet callsign.cs.buffalo.edu 2000
73

Date: Sat, 28 Aug 1993 18:28:18 GMT
From: spsgate!mogate!newsgate!nuntius@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Updating the test
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <25ligt\$qfl@hydra.unm.edu> , keith@unm.edu writes:
>Your extreme case of my argument (public safety hazards) *could* be
>argued (plane crash, hundred stranded, beacon smashed, ham with HT but
>mic busted, can only give location in CW using ptt key, but only station
>in range has a tech minus at the helm), (or, yedder bet, ham *builds a
>CW rig from plane remnants :) but that was not my point. Riffraff
>reduction does not have to save lives, it need only make the airwaves
>a little cleaner.

Keith,

You have missed my point. What are the reasons for the government being involved at all. I wrote "I must demonstrate I have the motor skills and judgment to operate a vehicle in a safe and prudent manner. The same applies for a pilots license. The FCC has a responsibility to ensure that "hobbyist's" in the ham bands don't cause an emissions outside their authorized freq. ranges."

Other than that why should the government care how I enjoy my hobby. The point here is the FCC is in a position to administrate the culture of this hobby, and I feel their involvement should be limited to whacking the idiots who produce out of band emissions or infringe on the rights of other amateurs. The skills I should demonstrate to the FCC are those that will ensure as a hobbyist, I don't infringe on other persons rights

in and out of the amateur band. Why should the FCC be the paternal grandfather of the hobby? Do they really care if I learn code at 13 or 20 wpm? The riff raff is already here I hear it on the net all the time.

The amateur community has done a wonderful job of dealing with them for years. So lets shut the door on other potential hams because they don't want to learn a dying art. If Code is important to some....open some parts of the band to CW only. Just don't ax my HF voice privileges because I WON'T learn the code.

In article <CCFzE1.Fu1@fc.hp.com> Perry Scott, perry@fc.hp.com writes:
>2. Applicant seriousness. It took me about 48 hours of study to go from
> 5 to 13 wpm and another 48 for 13 to 20 wpm. Any proposal should
> have sufficient challenge built in so as not to give away licenses.

Tell me why I must demonstrate my "seriousness"? Other than infringing on the rights of others why should I be more or less serious than the next guy?? I may want nothing more than to talk to some other country once a month.

>4. Fairness#2. Let's not weight this too far toward academia. We need
> to give the 12 yr olds a chance at Extra.

The point here is to try to ascertain the level of competence. If a 12 yr old has learned enough to operate the station without:

- A. burning down the house
- B. annoying the neighbors
- C. Interfering with the local PD or other EMS agencies (out of band emissions).
- D. annoying other hams on the band by causing willful interference.
- E. being out of band or over powered.

Then who cares if he is a novice or extra working CW or Voice?

Not I

Instead of giving politicians the keys to the city, Maybe we should
change the locks!

Rick Aldom ex STS1/SS*The opinions expressed are my
Sub Sailors do it deeper**own and probably aren't yours!

Date: Sun, 29 Aug 1993 00:54:45 GMT
From: news.cerf.net!pagesat!indirect.com!nu7i@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Aug27.154409.25938@kd4nc.uucp>,
<27AUG199314504023@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov>, <1993Aug28.011141.13808@kd4nc.uucp>
Subject : Re: MARS ops who are not hams?

Ok, I agree that many amateur ops do not have formal traffic handling skills. Perhaps, this should be represented in questions on the updated exams. 73

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #312
